

***Clark County
Clean Water Commission
2003 Annual Report***

To

***Clark County
Board of Commissioners***

Clark County
Department of Public Works
June 28, 2004

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members:

Mr. Art Stubbs, Chair 2004

(Vice Chair, 2003)
6804 NE 86th Court
Vancouver, WA 98662

Mrs. Susan Rasmussen, Vice

Chair 2004 (Chair 2003)
30101 NE 58th Avenue
La Center, WA 98629

Mr. Robert Agard

20202 NE 107th St.
Battle Ground, WA 98604

Ms. Judy Schramm

6112 NE 55 Circle
Vancouver, WA 98661

Mr. Don Steinke

4833 NE 238th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98682

Ms. Anne Jackson

2613 NW 199th Street
2614 Ridgefield, WA 98642

Ms. Virginia van Breemen

P.O. Box 559
4106 NE Stoughton Road
La Center, WA 98629

Mr. Bill Owen

12713 NW 21st Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685

Former 2004 CWC Members:

Mrs. Mary Martin

3012 NW 133rd St.
Vancouver, WA 98685

Former 2003 CWC Members:

Mr. Dana Kemper (Chair 2002)

East Ridge Limited Partnership
11805 NE 99th Street, Suite 1160
Vancouver, WA 98682

Mr. Cal Ek

PO Box 3097
Battle Ground, WA 98604

On behalf of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, I approve the 2003 Annual Report to the Board of Clark County Commissioners.

Clean Water Commission Chair

Date

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Role of the Clark County Clean Water Commission.....	3
3. Review of 2003 Activities.....	3
4. Status of 2002 Next Steps.....	3
5. Motions.....	4
6. Clean Water Commission Meetings.....	8
7. Additional Actions.....	8
8. Next Steps.....	10

Appendices:

A. Criteria for Ranking Clean Water Program Capital Improvements

B. 2003-04 Clean Water Program Budget

C. Clean Water Program: Performance Audit

Introduction and Background

This report provides the Clark County Board of Commissioners an overview of Clark County Clean Water Commission work efforts in 2003. The report focuses on the role of the Clean Water Commission and their accomplishments from the past year.

The report includes a description of each “motion” and “additional actions” from, along with next steps for 2004. Information about the each Clean Water Program Capital Improvement and summary of the 2003-04 budget are also included in this report.

Role of the Clark County Clean Water Commission

The nine-member Clark County Clean Water Commission (Commission) serves as an advisory body to the Board of Clark County Commissioners (BOCC) to provide advice and recommendations regarding Clean Water related issues. The Commission is charged with the following responsibilities:

- Represent a balanced interest in storm and surface water treatment and regulation;
- Make recommendations to the BOCC on such matters as the focus of the Clean Water Program, program service levels, budget, and policies on surface and stormwater issues;
- Provide oversight regarding the budget and activities;
- Draft a recommendation to the BOCC for creating an incentive program through which service charges may be adjusted for property owners who significantly reduce the impacts of stormwater runoff from their property;
- Provide quarterly progress reports (reporting will be done by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission) and a written annual report, to the BOCC on the effectiveness of the Clean Water Management Program. This report will include the following:
 - establish and set forth the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program;
 - goals and objectives for the upcoming year;
 - a summary of revenues and expenditures by watershed, zip code, or other easily identifiable geographic means;
 - a summary of public comments; and
 - clean water/stormwater program coordination among other agencies, groups, and citizens at large.

Review of 2003 Activities

The Commission continues to provide enhanced oversight of the Clark County Clean Water Program and addressing Clean Water Program fee and other program-related issues; this is especially true during meetings in Dollars Corners, La Center, Amboy, and Camas.

Status of 2002 Next Steps

The Commission began 2003 with several priorities identified in the 2002 Annual Report:

- Continued enhancement of Clark County’s stormwater quality monitoring program.
Results: The Commission continually receives from Clark County Public Works, Water Resources information about Clean Water Program supported water quality activities. This provides the Commission and the community a better understanding about where monitoring is occurring and the condition of local water bodies.

- Continued input in the selection and support of stormwater quality and treatment projects.
Results: As described under “additional actions” the Commission approved four Clean Water Program Capital Improvement projects to be implemented in 2003-04 (some projects are joint county and state road projects), and another nine projects for implementation in 2004-05 to reduce stormwater’s adverse impact to water bodies (see Motion 2003-0604-04).
- Provide oversight of the 2003-04 Clean Water Program budget.
Results: The Commission has requested, and received, from Clark County Public Works, Water Resources additional budgetary information throughout the year. This includes reports describing how funds are being expended within the capital, monitoring, education, enforcement, operation, and administration elements of the Clean Water Program.
- Promote greater public awareness and understanding for the protection of surface water and groundwater from stormwater contamination.
Results: The commission has and continues to support Clean Water Program educational efforts to students, businesses, and citizens in general. With the support of the Commission, Clark County Public Works, Water Resources has put into action activities that have educated hundreds of students, and taught numerous citizens about the need to protect water quality.

Motions

Commission activities include the following motions, actions, and next steps.

Motion 2003-0205-01: Mr. Stubbs moves that this Commission recognize with commendations Cal Ek, Robert Agard, and our past chairman Dana Kemper, for the work that they have done on the Clean Water Commission.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Complete—Commissioners Ek, Agard, and Kemper received recognition for their work effort.

Motion 2003-0507-02: Mr. Steinke moves for the Department of Community Development to submit proposals on what improvements need to be made so the Clean Water Commission can support you.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Complete—The Department of Community Development generated the following list of concerns.

- “bio-bag” removal after the development is complete....who will remove the bio-bags?
- erosion control certification course....what should be improved in the course and how often should re-certification occur?
- re-gain the momentum and importance of good erosion control best management practices....how can we encourage the inspectors to push for good best management practices on building sites?

The Department of Community Development achieved the following accomplishments in 2003:

- Development of an erosion control handbook for easy reference for inspectors.
- Development of an erosion prevention and control log for contractors to log their erosion monitoring and activities.
- Informational letters specific to homeowners, to prevent yard-related erosion.

- Design an educational display board about erosion and sediment control.
- Ongoing training / presentations for the inspectors.
- Assist with the design of large erosion control signs now posted at developments.

Motion 2003-0604-03: Mr. Owen moves to have Water Resources staff dig up the rationale for the Board of County Commissioners rejecting the proposed incentive and for the Clean Water Commissioners to look at it and move forward to come up with a workable incentive.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Complete—This issue was addressed at the June 2003 Board and Clean Water Commission Luncheon:

- Mrs. Rasmussen asked the Board of County Commissioners what the status was of the Clean Water Program Service Fee incentive identified in the Clean Water Commission 2001 Annual Report to the Board of County Commissioners.
- Commissioner Pridemore replied that the Board of County Commissioners has not decided one way or the other on that particular incentive.
- Mr. Barron added that the Clean Water Program Service fee is still subject to lawsuits and until those are settled it is difficult to grant incentives.
- Commissioner Morris also noted that the Clean Water Program Service Fee funds are being used to allow the county to catch up with the all the requirements of the NPDES permit (all the additional work above and beyond what was required before the permit was issued).
- Mrs. Rasmussen commented that any Clean Water Program Service Fee incentive should address more than just commercial or industrial businesses. Citizens who perform water quality testing or stormwater volume control on their land should qualify for an incentive.
- Mr. Agard felt that there should be no reward program or incentives for any new development. Incentives should be awarded to those that have old or no current stormwater treatment system.
- Commissioner Morris offered that one way to reward individuals may be to provide bumper stickers or certificates to acknowledge the good work some are doing.
- Commissioner Pridemore added that there could be more press about what people are doing to protect water.
- Mrs. Rasmussen suggested that non-profit businesses be exempt from the Clean Water Program Service fee.
- Mr. Rowell replied that according to the County's Prosecuting Attorney's Office, if one individual is exempt, individuals with like land use must be also exempt (even those not protecting water from pollution).

Motion 2003-0604-04: Mrs. Martin moves to recommend funding the first nine capital improvement projects.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Table 1 shows seven of the nine capital improvement projects that were submitted to the Board for approval and funding. Two projects that did not make the list are Salmon Creek Lowland Outfall project and Maplewood Meadows Stormwater Retrofit. The permitting costs for the Salmon Creek Lowland Outfall project are greater than the estimated \$75,000 earmarked to implement the project. The Maplewood Meadows Stormwater facility requires negotiations to obtain ownership of the property. A list of the final capital improvement projects are provided in Table 1.

Table 1 2004-05 Clean Water Program Capital Improvement Projects

Facility Name	Description	Sub-watershed	Cost of Total Project	% CWP Fund	Total Project Cost
Suds Creek Stormwater	Expand an existing stormwater facility on county land	Suds Creek	\$75,000	100%	\$75,000
Scheuler Stormwater Facility	New stormwater and wetland enhancement	Curtin Creek	\$300,000*	15%	~\$2,000,000*
Salmon Creek Historic Channel	Retrofit abandoned channel for treatment	Salmon Creek main stem	\$395,127	100%	\$395,127
Bliss Road/NW 36 th Ave. Stormwater	Retrofit existing a stormwater facility for water quality purposes	Salmon Creek main stem	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000
Gabbert Mitigation	New stormwater / flood plain enhancement	Mill Creek	\$500,000*	39%	~\$1,300,000*
North of Salmon Creek and Highway 99 Stormwater Facility	Installation of swales and water quality filters	Salmon Creek main stem	\$590,180	99%	\$595,180*
Lalonde Creek Stormwater Facility	Installation of detention ponds	Lalonde Creek	\$262,160	100%	\$262,160
Total			\$2,169,103		\$4,674,103

* Joint project with the county road program (Road Fund)

** Developer contribution

Motion 2003-0702-05: Mr. Agard moves that we discuss this [incentives / fee reductions] on the next agenda so the whole board has time to read it all. *Note: Information in brackets added.*

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: At subsequent Clean Water Commission meetings it was determined that no monetary incentive could be implemented. Instead businesses, groups, and individuals should be recognized for their efforts to protect water quality. These could include certificates, as well as articles in local newspapers and journals.

Motion 2003-0806-06: Mr. Agard moves to postpone this [the Clean Water Fee rate relating to the Green Mountain Golf Course] until we have some direction from the County Engineer who will be looking at the appeal and also some direction from the legal department in what we should be looking at and then re-schedule from that point on. *Note: Information in brackets added.*

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: This is on hold until Green Mountain Golf Course transfers a parcel, which includes Ingle Road, to Clark County.

Motion 2003-0806-07: Mr. Bill Owen moves for staff to provide the Clean Water Commission information about various billing systems and reductions.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Complete. On September 3, and September 24, 2003 Commissioners reviewed several billing options and reductions. It was determined that Clean Water Program fee incentives should be reviewed annually, and may include providing a certificate of appreciation to recognize water quality protection work, and a series of water quality stories to be submitted to the media. (Also see Motion 2003-0702-05.)

Motion 2003-0806-08: Mr. Stubbs moves to pay off the road fund loan. [Actually, it is the General Fund]

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: An amount of \$903,280 from the Clean Water Fund was paid back to the General Fund to pay off the 2000 loan from the General Fund. Note: Information in brackets added

Motion 2003-090309: Ms. Rasmussen moves to send a letter to Mr. Frisby and thank him for his suggestion.

Results: On September 24, 2003 Commissioners sent a letter to Mr. Frisby thanking him for the idea of checking vehicles for an oil leak while receiving an air quality emission test. The Washington Department of Ecology concluded, while they liked the concept, currently there are too many constraints in operating vehicle emission facilities to manage another informational item. Clark County Public Works, Water Resources determined that auto licensing locations and business providing oil changes, etc., may provide a more relaxed environment for citizens to learn how they can minimize leaks from their vehicles (and protect water quality).

Motion 2003-1105-10: Mr. Stubbs moves for Susan Rasmussen to send Sam Giese a letter of appreciation for all of his hard work on behalf of the Clean Water Commission.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: A letter of appreciation was mailed to Sam Giese on March 3, 2004.

Motion 2003-1105-11: Mrs. Rasmussen moves to have the July 7, 2004 Clean Water Commission meeting in the Hockinson area.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: The July 7, 2004 Clean Water Commission meeting will be held at Hockinson Middle School.

Motion 2003-1105-12: Mrs. Rasmussen moves for the Clean Water Commission to nominate Mr. Frisby for a Certificate of appreciation in special recognition for his contribution to the Clean Water Program.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: The Clean Water Commission is working on developing a Certificate of Appreciation.

Motion 2003-1105-13: Ms. Schramm moves for the Clean Water Commission to recognize Clark County Solid Waste for their pollution prevention work, which was acknowledged with an award from Governor Locke.

Motion passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners

Results: Once a certificate of appreciation is developed, one will be presented to Clark County Public Works, Solid Waste.

Clean Water Commission Meetings

In 2003, the Commission once again held meetings different regions of Clark County. These are identified in bold:

January 8, 2003 at Fire District #11, Fire Station at Dollar' Corner, 21609 NE 72nd Avenue

February 5, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

March 5, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

April 2, 2003 at La Center Community Center

May 7, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

June 4, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

July 2, 2003 at Amboy Grange Hall

August 6, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

September 3, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

October 1, 2003 at the Camas Police Station, 2100 NE 3rd, Camas, Washington

November 5, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

December 3, 2003 at Clark County Public Works, Operations, 4700 NE 78 Street, Conf. Room B-1

Additional Actions

The Commission carried out several activities in 2003. These include:

- Continued support for 2003-04 capital improvements. By December 2003, four of these capital improvements totaling over \$1,065,000 reached 99% completion (weather condition and final reporting were factors). These projects are:
 - Salmon Creek and Highway 99 Stormwater Treatment Facilities: This \$141,000 project is collecting and providing treatment of stormwater runoff from Highway 99 and nearby commercial and industrial properties south of Salmon Creek. Stormwater enters an underground vault where it is treated by 26 "filter cartridges" before it discharges into Salmon Creek.
 - Cougar Creek Infiltration Project: This \$340,000 project is a pilot program for stormwater runoff improvements in the Cougar Creek Basin. This is a basin that is heavily developed with housing and lacks sufficient water treatment method. This has resulted in the building of stormwater treatment manholes and 29 infiltration drywells to capture and infiltrate stormwater for the two-year storm event.

- Thomas Wetland Treatment Project (or Thomas Lake Project): The \$404,000 project is a joint effort with the Clark County Road Program (the total project is \$917,155); the project turned a degraded wetland into a facility with enhanced stormwater treatment of primarily residential runoff, drainage, and flood control capabilities. Approximately six new acres of wetlands with improved ecological functions are in place.
- Interstate 205 Stormwater Treatment Retrofit at Salmon Creek: The approximately \$180,000 project is a joint County and Washington Department of Transportation effort. Through the installation of a collection and treatment system from the interstate run off is being captured and treated before it discharges into Salmon Creek.
- Support for 2004-05 Capital Improvements:
 - One of the seven 2004-05 Clean Water Capital projects is complete (Lalonde Creek Sub-basin Stormwater Improvements): The \$262,000 project is a joint effort with county roads to improve stormwater quality treatment and drainage on Lalonde Creek at NE 119th. It provides better erosion control in Lalonde Creek.
 - Formation of a Clean Water Commission Capital Improvements Sub-committee to recommend capital projects that provide greater water quality protection in 2004-05: This sub-committee consisted of Commissioners Owen, Rasmussen, Schramm, Stubbs, Martin, and van Breemen; Donna Hale, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Scott Tkach, City of Vancouver; and Sam Giese, Clark County Public Works. The sub-committee developed project ranking criteria (cost and value, partnership, preservation and restoration, environmental design, future needs, feasibility, and life cost factors) for approval by the full Commission and Pete Capell, P.E., Director of Public Works/County Engineer (see Appendix “A”). They used the criteria to identify; review, and rank over 20 potential Clean Water Capital Improvements projects and in recommending the capital improvements listed in Table 1 (see Motion 2003-0604-04).
- Participating in the Clean Water Program Watershed Stewards program and Volunteer Monitoring Program: Commissioners have learned how citizens are educating and involving themselves in activities that promote water quality protection; commissioners too are enhancing through these efforts their own understanding about how to protect local water resources. The Commission also actively supports the Small Acreage Landholder Program.
 - Watershed Stewards Program: The program provides citizen an interactive opportunity to learn about water protection and apply their new skills in the community. This includes over nearly 2,300 volunteer hours (a \$41,300 value) to share information to more than 8,000 people, restore streamside and monitor streams.
 - Volunteer Monitoring Program: Trained volunteers are working to monitor chemical, biological, and physical habitat conditions at four stream sites.
 - Small Acreage Landholder Program: The effort helps new and veteran rural landowners understand how to manage their land and animals to protect water quality.
- Addressing Clean Water Program Service fee questions from program customers.
- Continuing to provide oversight of Clean Water Program activities, budget, and implementation of the Auditor’s Office recommendations (ensure Auditor Office recommendations are implemented) (see Appendix “B” and “C”).

Next Steps

The Commission sees room for improvement in the Clean Water Program. In 2004, the Commission will focus on the following priorities:

1. Ensure Clark County Auditor recommendations are implemented
2. Participate in the development of the 2005-06 Clean Water Program budget
3. Commissioner to promote (champion or become a recognized face and voice in the community) greater public awareness and understanding for protection of surface water and groundwater from stormwater contamination
4. Continued enhancement of Clark County's stormwater water monitoring program
5. Continued input in the selection of and support for stormwater quality and treatment projects
6. Explore fee incentives and other administrative/regulatory avenues to further reduce and treat stormwater at its source.

For additional information regarding this report, the Clark County Clean Water Commission, or about the Clark County Clean Water Program, contact:

*Clark County
Public Works Department
Water Resources
(360) 397-6118, ext 4345*

H:\ROWELL\NPDES\cwc 2003 report to boccc 040204.doc

Appendix A

5/2/2003

The most desirable projects for early construction are those that meet these goals

Goal	Description	Project Name:	Total Possible Points	Points Awarded
	Is the candidate project a:			
Cost Value	Project that provides good preservation or restoration value for the investment.		25	
Partnership	Project that uses CWP funds as a match to obtain additional funds or project partners. OR - A project that uses existing county land and facilities to improve water quality.		20	
Restoration	Project that addresses known pollutant hot spots/or contributors to impaired waters		20	
Stewardship	Project that provides net environmental benefit while minimizing impacts. Or - A project that uses or enhances natural processes as much as possible		15	
Future Need	Project in basins that are at risk of increased development impacts.		10	
Feasibility	Projects that won't be stopped or slowed by factors such as permitting or land ownership issues.		5	
Life Cost	Project that is cost effective to maintain.		5	

Possible total 100 points

100

Appendix B

2003-04 Clean Water Program Budget as of March 31, 2004

(period expended = 62.5%)

Object Code	Program Element	Budget	% of Total Budget	Expenditures	% Spent	Budget Remaining	Comments
Capital Improvements		\$3,431,151	32.83%	\$1,596,379	46.53%	\$1,834,772	
100s	Salaries	\$335,113	3.21%	\$290,470	86.68%	\$44,643	a
200s	Benefits	\$82,337	0.79%	\$64,866	78.78%	\$17,471	
300s	Supplies	\$10,400	0.10%	\$192,332		-\$181,932	b
400s	Outside Services	\$736,650	7.05%	\$180,817	24.55%	\$555,833	c
500s	Inter-Governmental Services	\$0	0.00%	\$915		-\$915	d
600s	Capital Outlay	\$1,430,000	13.68%	\$702,571	49.13%	\$727,429	c
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$836,651	8.00%	\$164,408	19.65%	\$672,243	c
Water Quality Monitoring, Data Base Management, and Reporting		\$1,366,008	13.07%	\$697,917	51.09%	\$668,091	
100s	Salaries	\$544,051	5.20%	\$359,520	66.08%	184,531	a
200s	Benefits	\$148,684	1.42%	\$74,683	50.23%	74,001	
300s	Supplies	\$27,100	0.26%	\$20,772	76.65%	6,328	
400s	Outside Services	\$573,700	5.49%	\$194,031	33.82%	379,669	e
500s	Inter Gov. Service	\$0	0.00%	\$4,048		-4,048	f
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$72,473	0.69%	\$44,863	61.90%	27,610	e
Public Education and Outreach		\$1,196,789	11.45%	\$401,080	33.51%	\$795,709	
100s	Salaries	\$383,778	3.67%	\$181,221	47.22%	\$202,557	a
200s	Benefits	\$108,272	1.04%	\$40,707	37.60%	\$67,565	
300s	Supplies	\$22,800	0.22%	\$1,556	6.82%	\$21,244	
400s	Outside Services	\$354,001	3.39%	\$24,290	6.86%	\$329,711	g
500s	Inter-Governmental Services	\$286,020	2.74%	\$99,804	34.89%	\$186,216	g
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$41,918	0.40%	\$53,502	127.63%	-\$11,584	g
Regulation and Enforcement		1,138,982	10.90%	560,910	49.25%	578,072	
100s	Salaries	0	0.00%	921		-921	a
200s	Benefits	0	0.00%	168		-168	a
400s	Outside Services	0	0.00%	11,870		-11,870	h
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	1,138,982	10.90%	547,951	48.11%	591,031	i
Operations and Maintenance		\$1,654,965	15.83%	\$912,661	55.15%	\$742,304	
100s	Salaries	\$126,899	1.21%	\$8,740	6.89%	118,159	j
200s	Benefits	\$28,000	0.27%	\$2,248	8.03%	25,752	
400s	Outside Services	\$0	0.00%	\$4,438		-4,438	k
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$1,500,066	14.35%	\$897,235	59.81%	602,831	l
Administration & Coordination		\$675,224	6.46%	\$521,082	77.17%	\$154,142	
100s	Salaries	\$109,561	1.05%	\$143,912	131.35%	-\$34,351	j
200s	Benefits	\$29,769	0.28%	\$30,403	102.13%	-\$634	j
300s	Supplies	\$10,600	0.10%	\$7,844	74.00%	\$2,756	
400s	Outside Services	\$100,341	0.96%	\$126,966	126.53%	-\$26,625	m
600s	Capital Outlay	\$0	0.00%	\$93		-\$93	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$424,953	4.07%	\$211,864	49.86%	\$213,089	n
Additional Actions		\$989,405	9.47%	\$989,405	100.00%	\$0	
550	Operating Transfer	\$86,125	0.82%	\$86,125	100.00%	\$0	o
790	Other Debt Principal	\$882,000	8.44%	\$882,000	100.00%	\$0	p
820	Interest Interfund Debt	\$21,280	0.20%	\$21,280	100.00%	\$0	p
Total		\$10,452,524	100.00%	\$5,679,434	54.34%	\$4,773,090	

Appendix B

2003-04 Clean Water Program Budget as of March 31, 2004

(period expended = 62.5%)

>>Turn page to see comments>>

Comments:

- a) *The 2003-04 budget will cover staffing cost for all program elements through 12/31/04.*
- b) *The cost is based on: object code 380: \$116,122 for road material for Thomas Lake CIP (#400110); code 381: \$4,300 drainage material for Thomas Lake and \$6,000 for Drainage Improvement District #7; code 384: \$4,200 for aggregate material for DID #7 and \$750 for Thomas Lake; code 389: \$8,900 for other engineering material for the Thomas Lake and Salmon Creek/Hwy 99 CIPs*
- c) *This covers the design and the construction cost of several new CIPs and implementation of retrofits to improve stormwater quality control and treatment.*
- d) *A cost attributed to the Thomas Lake CIP.*
- e) *Installation of rainfall and stream gauges, collecting and testing samples, and reporting findings*
- f) *This represents watershed characterization work in coordination with the Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery Board.*
- g) *This supports the following: Watershed Stewards, Small Acreage Program, Environmental Information Cooperative, and development of the Clean Water Program Billing Insert and Annual Report; and supports the Clean Water Commission. It also provides funds for general public outreach and education to promote water quality education to the community.*
- h) *This is \$10,171 is for an interlocal agreement to provide K-12 water quality classes in the urban area outside the city of Vancouver; \$1K is for annual maintenance of the digital imaging program*
- i) *The Department of Community Development is implementing this effort and will bill the CWP every six months.*
- j) *Some salaries will be moved from Operation and Maintenance to Administration and Coordination. These are funds already designated for PW Water Resources staff.*
- k) *An amount of \$2,369 is the program element's share for digital imaging work (scanning of documents into an electronic system; the remaining cost is copy rental and support costs.*
- l) *Public Works Operations implements this part of the CWP and bills the CWP every six months.*
- m) *This is the cost of the Washington Department of Ecology NPDES Permit Fee (~\$64,000); CC Hearing Examiner (~\$10,000); Rentals costs (~\$23,000); etc.*
- n) *Treasurer's services (\$318,000) and GIS work (\$40,000) for Clean Water Fee program database modifications and for addressing fee disputes; indirect is the remaining cost*
- o) *The \$86,125 supports watershed planning (wetland delineation grant work)*
- p) *About \$1.5 million in General Fund dollars was loaned to Public Works to establish the Clean Water Program. The agreement called for the loan and interest to be paid back over a 10-year period. However, in September 2003, the CC Clean Water Commission approved paying off the approximately \$903K loan balance using dollars from the approximately \$6 million CWP Fund Balance.*

Appendix C

Clean Water Program: Performance Audit **June 18, 2003**

:\\rowell\\npdes\\cwc 2003 report to boccc 040204.doc



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

AUDITOR
GREG KIMSEY

Public Works Department

CLEAN WATER PROGRAM

Performance Audit

Clark County Auditor's Office

Report No. 03-3
June 18, 2003

INTERNAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT

1300 Franklin Street, P.O. Box 5000, Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

(360) 397-2310, Fax (360) 397-6007, www.clark.wa.gov/auditor

Executive Summary

We reviewed the county's Clean Water Program to: (1) evaluate monitoring processes for program accountability; (2) determine whether fee assessments are computed and invoiced in accordance with Clark County ordinances and to assess the effectiveness and timeliness of collection procedures for delinquent fees; and (3) identify opportunities for enhancing program processes.

Program Monitoring for Accountability

We found that during the first three years, the Clean Water Program had no formal processes in place to monitor and track program activity. As a result, progress toward program goals has been slow, and staff have been unable to present the positive results of work that has been accomplished. A change in planning formats, brought about by the Public Works' Department director in 2003, has begun to show more focus on program accomplishments. **We recommend** that staff continue work in this direction, specifically in the development of project tasks, milestones, budgets and related performance measures.

Fee Computation and Collections

In June 2002, we issued an interim report that covered the fee assessment computations and collection actions related to delinquent program accounts. This final report contains updated data related to the fees and collections, but our observations remain unchanged. While assessment and computation of fees are in accordance with the county ordinance, the database used for this process does not contain all the data necessary to make the fee assessments as accurate as they could be. The billing system is not able to produce reports that would facilitate more timely collection activities. **We recommend** that the county continue exploring alternatives to the current billing and receipting system.

Enhancement of Program Effectiveness

There are several opportunities for enhancement of program effectiveness. The more formal processes, recently put into place, require the staff to focus on performance measures related to individual projects. By doing this, staff may be able to develop measures that are outcome based and specific to discrete projects and activities. Managers would then be better able to evaluate mission accomplishment. **We recommend** that outcome based performance measures be developed as part of the planning process currently being implemented.

The Program has been slow to implement Capital Improvement Projects, and funding for these types of projects continues to accumulate. **We recommend** that emphasis be placed on developing and implementing projects that will accomplish program goals.

Other departments or offices working on a reimbursable basis under Memoranda of Understanding with the Clean Water Program are required to submit invoices with supporting documentation on a quarterly basis. We found some invoices were as much as 6 months late. Costs cannot be recorded in correct accounting periods if the invoices are not submitted on time. **We recommend** that departments and offices submit their invoices and support documents in a timely fashion for processing and payment.